arXiv:1608.05746v1 [math.NT] 19 Aug 2016

SUP-NORM OF EIGENFUNCTION OF FINITELY MANY HECKE OPERATORS

SUBHAJIT JANA

Abstract. Let ϕ be a Laplace eigenfunction on a compact hyperbolic surface attached to an order in a quaternion algebra. Assuming that ϕ is an eigenfunction of Hecke operators at a *fixed finite* collection of primes, we prove an L^∞-norm bound for ϕ that improves upon the trivial estimate by a power of the logarithm of the eigenvalue. We have constructed an amplifier whose length depends on the support of the amplifier on Hecke trees. We have used a method of Bérard in [1] to improve the archimedean amplification.

1. introduction

1.1. **Main Theorem.** Let M be a compact Riemannian manifold and ϕ be a function on M that satisfies $\Delta\phi + \lambda^2\phi = 0$ and $\|\phi\|_2 = 1$, where Δ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on M and by $\|\phi\|_p$ we mean $\|\phi\|_{L^p(M)}$. It is known that (see e.g. [7]) one can have a general bound of the form

$$\|\phi\|_\infty \ll \lambda^{\nu(M)} \qquad \text{with} \qquad \nu(M) = \frac{\dim(M)-1}{2}. \tag{1.1}$$

It is usually believed that if the geodesic flow on the unit cotangent bundle of M is chaotic then the bound (1.1) can be improved. One result of this kind is due to Bérard [1], who proves that if M has negative sectional curvature, then one has

$$\|\phi\|_\infty \ll \frac{\lambda^{\nu(M)}}{\sqrt{\log\lambda}}. \tag{1.2}$$

The case of bounding the sup-norm of eigenfunctions on arithmetic manifolds is an interesting and more tractable problem due to automorphy and symmetries arising from the underlying Hecke algebra; one expects an improvement in (1.1), namely $\|\phi\|_\infty \ll \lambda^\epsilon$, on a compact hyperbolic surface. The first breakthrough was achieved by Iwaniec and Sarnak [9] who proved that on a compact arithmetic hyperbolic surface (such as a quotient of $\mathcal{H}^2$ by the group of units in an order of a quaternion division algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$) if ϕ is an eigenfunction of the *full* Hecke algebra then

$$\|\phi\|_\infty \ll_\epsilon \lambda^{\frac{5}{12}+\epsilon}.$$

While the most general question still remains open one can weaken the assumption of full Hecke symmetry and ask to improve upon the trivial estimate (1.2).

In this article we will prove an improved estimate than that of (1.2) assuming only that ϕ is an eigenfunction of p-Hecke operators for *fixed finitely many* primes p. Following the

pre-trace formula approach as in [9] we achieve a *power of logarithm* saving in (1.2). We will describe now our main theorem.

Let M be a compact hyperbolic surface. From the theorem of Cartan and Hadamard and uniformization theorem, $M = \Gamma\backslash\mathcal{H}^2$, where Γ is a discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. To make use of the Hecke symmetry we assume that Γ is a congruence subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. For the ease of presentation of the paper we will henceforth assume that Γ is the unit group of a maximal order in a quaternion division algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a fixed finite set of primes at which the underlying order is unramified.

Theorem 1. *Let ϕ simultaneously be a Maass form on M with Laplace eigenvalue λ and a Hecke eigenform of the p-adic Hecke algebra for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Then*

$$\|\phi\|_\infty \ll_{\mathcal{P}} \frac{\lambda^{1/2}}{(\log \lambda)^{\frac{|\mathcal{P}|+1}{2}}},$$

where $|\mathcal{P}|$ denotes the cardinality of $\mathcal{P}$.

There are several generalizations of the Iwaniec-Sarnak-type result in higher dimensional and higher rank arithmetic locally symmetric spaces (see e.g. [12], [2], [8], [3], [4], [5], [10] and their references). The idea of saving a power of eigenvalue in the sup-norm bound of a Maass form which is also eigenform of several Hecke operators, by now well-known to experts, lies in the amount of return Hecke operators make to the maximal compact. As far we know, in all previous literature regarding this problem, the authors have always assumed that the Maass form is also an eigenform of p-Hecke operators for infinitely many distinct prime p. This assumption enlarges the scope of use of Hecke symmetry and to have a better control on the Hecke returns. Here we are assuming that the Maass form is an eigenform of finitely many p-adic Hecke algebras. However, this weaker hypothesis allows us a weaker result than the result of [9].

1.2. **Remarks.**

(1) One can compare (1.2) and the bound in the Theorem 1 as the Hecke operator at prime p is saving $\sqrt{\log \lambda}$ from the former estimate. This is a non-archimedean analogue of the fact that each differential operator in the universal enveloping algebra of a locally symmetric space helps saving $\lambda^{1/2}$ from (1.1) (see [12]).

(2) The general idea of the proof of Theorem 1 is same as in [9]. But as we have, unlike [9], used the Hecke symmetry at only fintely many places, we could no longer use the usual Duke-Friedlander-Iwaniec-type amplifier which is supported on a fixed sphere on the Hecke-trees. On the other hand, inspired by [11], here we are using a different kind of amplifier which is supported on spheres of growing radii. The success of this amplifier depends on the size of its radius, whereas in the former case, depended on the number of primes contributing to the amplifier. A similar kind of amplifier has been constructed in [6].

(3) The bound we have proved in Theorem 1 should be optimal among the savings one can get following the Iwaniec-Sarnak method and using an amplifier which is constructed

by taking a linear combination of Hecke operators. For details one may look at the remark at §4.3.

(4) It can be understood from the proof that we can get a larger saving (as big as $e^{-c\sqrt{\log \lambda}}$ for $c > 0$) if ϕ is nontempered at certain prime, however, we do discuss it here.

(5) A similar approach can be followed to get a logarithm saving for the sup norm of Maass cusp forms which are eigenforms of finitely many Hecke operators on congruence quotient of hyperbolic 3-spaces.

We conclude the Introduction with remarking that the supnorm problem is essentially connected to the problem of multiplicity of the spectrum of the Laplacian (see [12]). One expects that on a arithmetic surfaces arising from unit group of maximal order (e.g. M), the spectrum of the Laplacian is essentially simple; in that case the improved result of [9] can be extended to general Maass forms.

1.3. **Acknowledgements.** We want to thank Lior Silberman whose supervision during author's masters thesis helped to start this project and also for encouragement. We also want to thank Paul Nelson for teaching us the amplification method he has used in [11] and numerous helpful suggestion on an earlier draft of this paper.

2. Non-Archimedean Amplification

2.1. **p-adic structure.** Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a quaternion division algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ be a maximal $\mathbb{Z}$-order in $\mathbb{H}$ and $\Gamma = \mathcal{O}^\times$ as assumed before. We will always assume p is a prime in $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathbb{H}$ splits at p (which happens for all but finitely many primes). Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the reduced norm on $\mathbb{H}$ defined by $\mathcal{N}(x) = x\bar{x}$.

Structure of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)/\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is a $p+1$-regular tree, naming it $\mathcal{T}$. Let us define

$$R(m) = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{O} \mid \mathcal{N}(\gamma) = m\};$$

clearly $R(1) = \Gamma$. There is a natural distance function on $\mathcal{T}$, which we call $d_{\mathcal{T}}$. We define the p^m'th Hecke operator by

$$T(p^m)f(z) = \frac{1}{p^{m/2}} \sum_{\gamma \in R(1)\backslash R(p^m)} f(\gamma z).$$

It is known that, as m grows to infinity the Hecke points $T(p^m)x = \{\gamma x \mid \gamma \in R(1)\backslash R(p^m)\}$ form a $p+1$-regular tree centered at x and $T(p)$ is the generator of the polynomial Hecke algebra of PGL_2 over $\mathbb{Q}_p$.

In general, we define the n'th Hecke operator by

$$T(n)f(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\gamma \in R(1)\backslash R(n)} f(\gamma z).$$

It is a standard fact that $T(n)$ can be written as a polynomial of $\{T(p)\}_{p|n}$. We also define the sphere operator on the tree $\mathcal{T}$ by

$$S(p^m)f(x) = \sum_{d_{\mathcal{T}}(y,x)=m} f(y).$$

It is easy to check that $p^{m/2}T(p^m) = \sum_{k\leq m; k\equiv m(2)} S(p^k)$ with $p^{1/2}T(p) = S(p)$.

2.2. **Construction of Amplifier.** Construction of this amplifier is inspired by Lemma 22 in [11]. Let us denote $\lambda_\phi(m)$ to be the eignevalue of a Hecke eigenform ϕ for the operator $T(m)$. We will often drop the subscript ϕ when it is clear which eigenform is being considered.

We will now choose our amplifier. We define

$$K_L = \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{L} \lambda_\phi(p^n) T(p^n) \right)^2. \tag{2.1}$$

Lemma 2.1. (1) *Let $M_{\mathcal{P},L} := \{M = \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} p^{k_p} \mid 1 \leq k_p \leq L\}$. For integer $L \geq 1$*

$$K_L = \sum_{m,n\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P},L)} \lambda_\phi(m)\lambda_\phi(n) \sum_{d|(m,n)} T(mn/d^2).$$

(2) *Any $\mathcal{P}$-Hecke eigenform is also a K_L eigenform with nonnegative eigenvalue. The K_L eigenvalue of ϕ is $\gg L^{2|\mathcal{P}|}$.*

To prove the Lemma 2.1 we first prove the main technical part.

Lemma 2.2. *Let p be an unramified prime. For any Hecke eigenform ϕ with $T(m)$-eigenvalues $\lambda(m)$,*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{L} |\lambda(p^n)|^2 \gg L.$$

Proof. Proof of this lemma is similar to that of Lemma 22 in [11] where author has proved an almost same bound for the eigenvalues of the sphere operators. We will first assume that ϕ is tempered at p. Then it is standard that one can write $\lambda(p) = \alpha + \beta$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}^{(1)}$, and

$$\lambda(p^n) = \frac{\alpha^{n+1} - \beta^{n+1}}{\alpha - \beta}.$$

We use the notation $\lll$ (and $\ggg$) as in [11]. For quantities X and Y which depend on n implicitly, by $X \lll Y$ we mean $\overline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} X/Y = 0$. $X \ggg Y$ is defined symmetrically.

If $|\alpha-\beta| \ggg 1/L$ then,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n\le L}|\lambda(p^n)|^2 &= \frac{2}{|\alpha-\beta|^2}\sum_{n\le L}(1-\Re(\alpha/\beta)^{n+1})\\ &\ge \frac{2}{|\alpha-\beta|^2}\left(L-\frac{2}{|\alpha-\beta|}\right)\\ &= \frac{2}{|\alpha-\beta|^2}(L+o(L)) \gg L.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand if $|\alpha-\beta| \ll 1/L$ then letting m to be the largest positive integer such that $m \le L$ and $m|\alpha-\beta| \le 1/10$ we see that $m \gg L$. Thus

$$\sum_{n=1}^{L}|\lambda(p^n)|^2 \ge |\lambda(p^m)|^2 \gg m^2 \gg L.$$

which concludes the proof in the tempered case.

Proving in non-tempered case is easy. We write $\sigma(p^m)$ for eigenvalue of $S(p^m)$. Letting $\cosh\alpha = \frac{\sigma(p)}{2p^{1/2}}$ it is straightforward to check that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n}\sigma(p^{2k}) = p^n\frac{\sinh(2n+1)\alpha}{\sinh\alpha} \ge (2n+1)p^n.$$

So $\lambda(p^{2n}) \gg n$. Similarly one can prove $\lambda(p^n) \gg n$. Thus obviously,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{L}|\lambda(p^n)|^2 \gg L^3 \gg L,$$

concluding the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Expanding (2.1) and using standard Hecke-multiplicativity

$$T(m)T(n) = \sum_{d|(m,n)}T(mn/d^2)$$

we immediately see (1):

$$\begin{aligned}K_L &= \left(\prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{L}\lambda(p^n)T(p^n)\right)\right)^2 = \left(\sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P},L)}\lambda(m)T(m)\right)^2\\ &= \sum_{m,n\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P},L)}\lambda(m)\lambda(n)\sum_{d|(m,n)}T(mn/d^2).\end{aligned}$$

From the definition of K_L nonnegativity of eigenvalues is clear, where as eignevalue of ϕ is,

$$\prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{L}|\lambda(p^n)|^2\right)^2 \gg L^{2|\mathcal{P}|},$$

where in the last inequality we have used Lemma 2.2. □

Here we prove a technical lemma which we will be using in the final phase of bounding.

Lemma 2.3. *For $L \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\sum_{m,n\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P},L)}|\lambda(m)\lambda(n)|\sum_{d|(m,n)}\left(\frac{\sqrt{mn}}{d}\right)^x \ll \begin{cases}\prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{r=1}^{L}|\lambda(p^r)|^2 & \text{if } x<0\\ \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}p^{xL}L\sum_{r=1}^{L}|\lambda(p^r)|^2 & \text{if } x\geq 0.\end{cases}$$

Proof. Writing $m, n \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, L)$ as $m = \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} p^{r_p}$ and $n = \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} p^{s_p}$ first we note that

$$\sum_{d|(m,n)} d^s = \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{d|(p^{r_p},p^{s_p})} d^s = \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{i=0}^{\min(r_p,s_p)} p^{is}.$$

Thus the sum, for $x < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\substack{r_p=1\\ p\in\mathcal{P}}}^{L}\sum_{s_p=1}^{L}\prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}|\lambda(p^{r_p})|p^{r_px/2}|\lambda(p^{s_p})|p^{s_px/2}\sum_{i=0}^{\min(r_p,s_p)}p^{-ix}\\
&\ll \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\left(\sum_{r=1}^{L}\sum_{s=1}^{L}|\lambda(p^r)\lambda(p^s)|p^{x|r-s|/2}\right)\\
&\ll \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\left(\sum_{l=0}^{L-1}p^{xl/2}\sum_{r=1}^{L-l}|\lambda(p^r)\lambda(p^{r+l})|\right)\\
&\ll \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\left(\sum_{l=0}^{L-1}p^{xl/2}\right)\left(\sum_{r=1}^{L-l}|\lambda(p^r)|^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{r=1}^{L-l}|\lambda(p^{r+l})|^2\right)^{1/2}\\
&\ll \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\left(\sum_{r=1}^{L}|\lambda(p^r)|^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

If $x \geq 0$ following a similar calculation we see that the sum

$$\ll \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \left(\sum_{r=1}^{L} \sum_{s=1}^{L} |\lambda(p^r)\lambda(p^s)| p^{(r+s)x/2} \right)$$
$$\ll \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} p^{xL} \left(\sum_{r=1}^{L} |\lambda(p^r)| \right)^2 \ll \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} p^{xL} L \left(\sum_{r=1}^{L} |\lambda(p^r)|^2 \right),$$

completing the proof. □

3. Revisiting Bérard's Theorem on a Compact Quotient

In this section we will revisit Bérard's theorem where a logarithm improvement of the error term in Weyl's eigenvalue counting formula is established on a negatively curved, connected and compact Riemannian n-dimensional manifold with boundary. Recall that Δ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator of M. We label the spectrum of $-\Delta$, counted with multiplicity, as

$$0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1^2 \leq \lambda_2^2 \leq \dots.$$

Suppose that $\{\phi_j\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$, containing ϕ, is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(M)$, such that, $-\Delta\phi_j = \lambda_j^2\phi_j$. Hörmander [7] proved an asymptotic for the eigenvalue counting function: for a constant C_M depending only on M,

$$N(\lambda) := \#\{\lambda_j \leq \lambda\} = C_M\lambda^n + O(\lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}}) \tag{3.1}$$

Bérard [1] proved that if M has nonpositive sectional curvature then one can improve (3.1) to

$$N(\lambda) := \#\{\lambda_j \leq \lambda\} = C_M\lambda^n + O\left(\frac{\lambda^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{\log\lambda}\right) \tag{3.2}$$

We will employ the same argument as in [1] to have an improved bound for the Archimedean kernel. In our context we fix $M = \Gamma\backslash\mathcal{H}^2$ and $n = 2$. We define the operator E_j on $C^\infty(M)$ as

$$E_j f(x) = \phi_j(x)\langle f, \phi_j\rangle = \phi_j(x)\int_M f(y)\overline{\phi_j(y)}d\mu.$$

We recall the standard spectral projector with E_j's, which is

$$h_\lambda f = \sum_{\lambda_j\in[\lambda,\lambda+1]} E_j f. \tag{3.3}$$

For the purpose of the proof of (3.2) we need to approximate the (3.3); which is as follows. By $\hat{f}$ we will denote the Fourier transform of f. Let $h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ be a Schwartz function such that

$$h(0) = 1, h \geq 0, \text{ and } \hat{h}(t) = 0 \text{ for } |t| \geq 1/2. \tag{3.4}$$

Such a function exists, as one can cook up h by taking the Fourier transform of the convolution of an even nonnegative function $0 \neq \chi \in C_c^\infty((-1/4, 1/4))$ with itself. Scaling the spectral window by a factor $\epsilon > 0$, which will be fixed later, we define that

$$\tilde{h}_\lambda^\epsilon f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h(\epsilon^{-1}(\lambda - \lambda_j))E_j f. \tag{3.5}$$

We also define a remainder operator by

$$r_\lambda f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h(\epsilon^{-1}(\lambda + \lambda_j))E_j f.$$

Then by the Fourier transform we get that,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{h}_\lambda^\epsilon f + r_\lambda f &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \epsilon \left(\int \hat{h}(\epsilon t) e^{-it\lambda_j} e^{it\lambda} dt + \int \hat{h}(\epsilon t) e^{it\lambda_j} e^{it\lambda} dt \right) E_j f \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int \epsilon \hat{h}(\epsilon t) e^{it\lambda} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \cos(t\lambda_j) E_j f \right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence equating the kernel of these operators we rewrite (3.5) as

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h(\epsilon^{-1}(\lambda-\lambda_j))\phi_j(x)\overline{\phi_j(y)} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h(\epsilon^{-1}(\lambda+\lambda_j))\phi_j(x)\overline{\phi_j(y)} = \frac{1}{\pi}\int \epsilon\hat{h}(\epsilon t)e^{it\lambda}\cos t\sqrt{-\Delta_M}(x,y)dt. \tag{3.6}$$

Recall the covering map p at $m \in M$; $p := \exp_m \colon T_m M \to M$. We pull back $f \in C^\infty(M)$ by p to $\tilde{f} \in C^\infty(\mathcal{H}^2)$ which is periodic with respect to Γ. Pulling the metric on M back to $\mathcal{H}^2$ and folding the right hand side we may rewrite the kernel as

$$(\cos t\sqrt{-\Delta_M})(\tilde{z}, \tilde{w}) = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} (\cos t\sqrt{-\Delta_{\mathcal{H}^2}})(\gamma z, w), \tag{3.7}$$

where $p(z) = \tilde{z}, p(w) = \tilde{w}$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{H}^2}$ is the Laplacian on $\mathcal{H}^2$. Combining with (3.6) we get that,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h(\epsilon^{-1}(\lambda-\lambda_j))\phi_j(z)\overline{\phi_j(w)} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h(\epsilon^{-1}(\lambda+\lambda_j))\phi_j(z)\overline{\phi_j(w)} = \frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\int \epsilon\hat{h}(\epsilon t)e^{it\lambda}\cos t\sqrt{-\Delta_{\mathcal{H}^2}}(\gamma z, w)dt. \tag{3.8}$$

This equation is the so-called pre-trace formula. By d_g we will denote the usual Riemannian distance on $\mathcal{H}^2$ with respect to its hyperbolic metric.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that for $\lambda^{-1} \leq \epsilon \leq 1$,*

$$\left| \int \epsilon \hat{h}(\epsilon t) e^{it\lambda} \cos t\sqrt{-\Delta_{\mathcal{H}^2}}(z,w) dt \right| \ll \begin{cases} \lambda\epsilon + e^{C/\epsilon}, \text{ if } z = w; \\ \left(\frac{\lambda}{d_g(z,w)}\right)^{1/2} e^{C/\epsilon}, \text{ if } 0 < d_g(z,w) \leq \epsilon^{-1}; \\ 0, \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For details of the proof we refer to Proposition 3.6.2 of [13], in particular, equations (3.6.8) and (3.6.9) of the same. Here we record a sketch of the proof for the sake of completeness.

Sketch of the proof. First we note that

$$u = \cos t\sqrt{-\Delta} f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \cos(t\lambda_j) E_j f$$

is the solution of the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - \Delta)u = 0, \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^+ \times M \\ u|_{t=0} = f, \partial_t u|_{t=0} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

As in [1] we may prove the lemma using theory of Hadamard's parametrix for the solution of the Cauchy problem (3.9). Here we are considering the kernel function on $(\mathbb{R}^2, g)$ instead of upper half plane, where g is the metric that makes $(\mathbb{R}^2, g)$ to be isometric to $\mathcal{H}^2$.

$$\cos(t\sqrt{-\Delta})(x,y) = \sum_{m=0}^{N} \alpha_m(x,y)\partial_t(E_m(t, d_g(x,y)) - E_m(-t, d_g(x,y))) + R_N(t,x,y),$$

where E_m are radial tempered distributions supported on $\{(t,x) \in [0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \mid d_g(x,0) \leq t\}$, defined by (as E_m's are radial in second variable, by abuse of notation, we are identifying the second entry of E_m as the distance from origin)

$$E_m(t,x) \equiv E_m(t, d_g(x,0)) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0_+} m!(2\pi)^{-3} \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i\langle x,\xi\rangle + it\tau} (d_g(\xi,0)^2 - (\tau - i\epsilon)^2)^{-m-1} d\xi d\tau,$$

where α_m are smooth functions on $M \times M$ with

$$\alpha_0(x,y) \leq 1, 0 < \alpha_0(x,x) = 1 \text{ and } |\partial_{x,y}^{\alpha} \alpha_m| \ll e^{O(d_g(x,y))}$$

and there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$R_N \in \mathcal{C}^{N-5}([-\delta, \delta] \times M \times M) \text{ with } |\partial_{t,x,y}^{\alpha} R_N| \ll |t|^{2N-|\alpha|} e^{O(t)}.$$

Thus to prove the lemma it is enough to show that,

$$\int \hat{h}(\epsilon t) e^{it\lambda} (\partial_t E_m(t,0) - \partial_t E_m(-t,0)) dt \ll \lambda^{1-2m},$$

and

$$\int \hat{h}(\epsilon t) e^{it\lambda} (\partial_t E_m(t,r) - \partial_t E_m(-t,r)) dt \ll (\lambda/r)^{1/2-m}.$$

Noting the fact that $t \mapsto \partial_t E_m(t,0) - \partial_t E_m(-t,0)$ is a homogeneous tempered distribution of degree $2m-1$. Therefore its Fourier transform is a radial homogeneous tempered distribution of degree $1-2m$. As $\int \hat{h}(\epsilon t)e^{it\lambda}(\partial_t E_m(t,0) - \partial_t E_m(-t,0))dt$ is the convolution of Fourier transformation of the above mentioned distribution and h we get the first estimate. For the second estimate we refer to the standard result of Lemma 3.5.3 of [13]. □

4. Counting and Bounds

4.1. **Estimating Hecke Returns.** We recall the definition of standard point pair invariant. Thinking upper half plane as $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SO}(2)$ we recognize a point $x+iy = z \in \mathcal{H}^2$ by gK, where $K = \mathrm{SO}(2)$. From the Iwasawa decomposition we write $g = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{y} & x\sqrt{y^{-1}} \\ & \sqrt{y^{-1}} \end{pmatrix} K$. We define a point pair invariant by

$$u(z,e) = \frac{x^2 + (y-1)^2}{4y}.$$

One may also note that $u(z,w) = \sinh^2(d_g(z,w)/2)$.. Fix $z \in M$. For $t > 0$ an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we define a counting function

$$M(N,t;z) = \#\{\gamma \in R(N) \mid u(\gamma z, z) < t\}.$$

Lemma 4.1. *For any $t > 1$*

$$M(N,t;z) \ll_\epsilon tN^{1+\epsilon}.$$

Also there exists a $\delta_N > 0$ such that $M(N,\delta;z) \ll_\nu N^\nu$ for all $\nu > 0$ small enough.

Proof. This is direct from Lemma 1.3 of [9] which says that for any $t > 0$

$$M(N,t;z) \ll ((t + t^{1/4})N + 1)N^\nu.$$

which immediately implies the first claim. For

$$t = \delta_N = N^{-4}, \tag{4.1}$$

the second claim is also true. □

4.2. **Final Bound.** In this section we will fix $\epsilon = c(\log\lambda)^{-1}$ in the Lemma 3.1 where $c > C$ is a constant to be fixed later. We will also denote $\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} K(\gamma x, y)$ to be the automorphic kernel, i.e.

$$K(x,y) = \frac{c}{\log\lambda} \int \hat{h}\left(\frac{ct}{\log\lambda}\right) e^{it\lambda} \cos(t\sqrt{-\Delta})(x,y)dt,$$

and h is as in (3.4).

Proof of Theorem 1. We choose an orthonormal Hecke-eigen basis containing ϕ in the pre-trace formula in (3.8). We apply our amplifier K_L in (2.1) to (3.8) on z variable and then

plug-in $z = w$. Using (3.4) and Lemma 2.1 and thus using non-negativity of each term of the left hand side of amplified pre-trace formula we deduce that,

$$A_L^2|\phi(z)|^2 \ll \sum_{m,n\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P},L)} \sum_{d|(m,n)} \frac{d}{\sqrt{mn}} \left|\lambda_\phi(m)\lambda_\phi(n) \sum_{\gamma\in R(mn/d^2)} K(\gamma z, z)\right|, \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$A_L := \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{L} |\lambda_\phi(p^n)|^2$$

and thus $A_L \gg L^{|\mathcal{P}|}$.

Recall that $u = \sinh^2(d_g/2)$. Thus from Lemma 3.1 we get that for any natural number N,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\gamma\in R(N)} K(\gamma z, z) &= \sum_{\substack{\gamma\in R(N)\\ u(\gamma z,z)<\delta}} K(\gamma z, z) + \sum_{\substack{\gamma\in R(N)\\ \delta\le u(\gamma z,z)\le\lambda^{1/c}}} K(\gamma z, z) \\ &\ll \frac{\lambda}{\log\lambda} M(N,\delta; z) + \left(\frac{\lambda}{\log(1+4\delta)}\right)^{1/2} \lambda^{C/c} M(N,\lambda^{1/c}; z) \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Now combining (4.2) and (4.3) and choosing $\nu = 1/10$ and $\delta = (\sqrt{mn}/d)^{-8}$ in d'th summand, from (4.1) we come to the conclusion that,

$$\begin{aligned} A_L^2|\phi(z)|^2 &\ll \sum_{m,n\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P},L)} \sum_{d|(m,n)} |\lambda_\phi(m)\lambda_\phi(n)| \left(\frac{\lambda}{\log\lambda}\left(\frac{\sqrt{mn}}{d}\right)^{2\nu-1} + \lambda^{1/2+C/c}\left(\frac{\sqrt{mn}}{d}\right)^{1/4} \lambda^{1/c}\left(\frac{\sqrt{mn}}{d}\right)^{4}\right) \\ &\ll \frac{\lambda}{\log\lambda} \sum_{m,n\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P},L)} |\lambda_\phi(m)\lambda_\phi(n)| \sum_{d|(m,n)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{mn}}{d}\right)^{-4/5} \\ &\qquad + \lambda^{1/2+(1+C)/c} \sum_{m,n\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P},L)} |\lambda_\phi(m)\lambda_\phi(n)| \sum_{d|(m,n)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{mn}}{d}\right)^{17/4} \\ &\ll \frac{\lambda}{\log\lambda} A_L + \lambda^{1/2+(C+1)/c} L^{|\mathcal{P}|} A_L \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} p^{17L/4}. \end{aligned}$$

We have used Lemma 2.3 in the last estimate. Choosing $L = \frac{\log\lambda}{100\log\prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} p}$ and $c = 4C+4$ we conclude that

$$|\phi(z)|^2 \ll \frac{\lambda}{(\log\lambda)^{|\mathcal{P}|+1}} + \lambda^{3/4+17/400} \ll \frac{\lambda}{(\log\lambda)^{|\mathcal{P}|+1}}.$$

which gives the result. □

4.3. **Remark.** One can understand from the proof that if we use an amplifier of the form $(\sum_m \alpha_m T(p^m))^2$ (definition of $T(n)$ is in §2) then the geometric side of the amplified pre-trace formula is *of the size* of

$$\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\log \lambda}} \times \sum |\alpha_m|^2.$$

Hence to get a saving from (1.2) we need $\frac{(\sum_m \alpha_m \lambda_\phi(^m))^2}{\sum_m |\alpha_m|^2}$ to be as big as possible, where $\lambda_\phi(p^m)$ is eigenvalue of ϕ under $T(p^n)$. By Cauchy-Schwarz this quotient is the largest when $\alpha_m = \lambda_\phi(p^m)$. On the other hand, size of $\sum_{m \leq L} |\lambda_\phi(p^m)|^2$ is compared to L, at least when ϕ is tempered at p; that restricts the saving to be at most power of logarithm of λ.

References

[1] Bérard, P.: *On the wave equation on a compact manifold without conjugate points*, Math. Z. 155 (1977), 249-276.

[2] Blomer, V.; Harcos, G.; Milićević, D.: *Bounds for eigenforms on arithmetic hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, Duke Math. J. 165 (2016), 625-659.

[3] Blomer, V.; Mága, P.: *The sup-norm problem for PGL*(4), IMRN 2015 (vol. 14), 5311-5332.

[4] Blomer, V.; Mága, P.: *Subconvexity for sup-norms of automorphic forms on PGL*(n), arXiv preprint.

[5] Blomer, V.; Pohl, A.: *The sup-norm problem on the Siegel modular space of rank two*, Amer. J. Math. 136 (2016), 999-1027.

[6] Brooks, S.; Lindenstrauss, E., *Non-localization of eigenfunctions on large regular graphs*, Israel Journal of Mathematics January 2013, Volume 193, Issue 1, pp 1-14.

[7] Hormander, L.: *The spectral function of an elliptic operator*, Acta Math., 121 (1968), pp. 193218.

[8] Holowinsky, R.; Ricotta, G.; Royer, E.: *On the sup norm of an SL*(3) *Hecke-Maass cusp form*, arXiv preprint.

[9] Iwaniec, H; Sarnak, P. *L^∞-norms of eigenfunctions of arithmetic surfaces*, Annals of Mathematics Second Series, Vol. 141, No. 2 (Mar., 1995), pp. 301-320.

[10] Marshall, S.: *Sup norms of Maass forms on semisimple groups*, arXiv preprint.

[11] Nelson, P: *Microlocal lifts and quantum unique ergodicity on* $\mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{Q}_p)$, arXiv preprint.

[12] Sarnak, P.: *Letter to Morawetz*, available at http://www.math.princeton.edu/sarnak/.

[13] Sogge, C.*Hangzhou lectures on eigenfunctions of the laplacian*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, 188. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2014. xii+193 pp. ISBN: 978-0-691-16078-8

ETH Zürich, Raemistrasse 101, 8092 Zürich

E-mail address: subhajit.jana@math.ethz.ch